Application No. 09/527,137 Amendment "D" dated July 6, 2005 Reply to Office Action mailed June 2, 2005



REMARKS

The Office Action, mailed June 2, 2005, considered claims 1-19, 23-32, 35-51, 54-56, 58-69, 72, 74-79 and 84-85. All of those claims were rejected, except for claims 84 and 85, which were allowed.¹

By this paper, claims 43, 2-19 and 23-41 have been amended², claims 1, 42, 78-79 have been cancelled, and new claim 86 has been added, such that claims 1-19, 23-32, 35-51, 54-56, 58-69, 72, 74-79, 84-86 remain pending. Claims 84-86 are the only independent claims at issue, with claim 84 being directed to a method, claim 85 being directed to a corresponding computer program product, and claim 86 being directed to a corresponding computing device.

As stated above, claims 84-85 were previously found allowable in the last action. Claim 86, which includes all of the limitations recited in claim 84, should, therefore, also be found allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 84 was found allowable in the last action.

The remaining claims, 1-19, 23-32, 35-51, 54-56, 58-69, 72, 74-79, which are all dependent claims, should also be found allowable for at least the same reasons because they include all of the limitations recited in claim 84.

In view of the foregoing, all of the rejections and objections of record are now moot, such that all of the pending claims should now be found in condition for immediate allowance.³

Claims 1, 2-11, 15-17, 19, 23-32, and 35-42, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411) in view of Klosterman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576), Sampat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724), and Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,536,041). Claims 13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411) in view of Klosterman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576), Sampat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724), and Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,536,041), and Sequeira (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0000194). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411) in view of Klosterman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576), Sampat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724), and Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,536,041), and Heckerman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,134). Claims 43-51, 54-46, 58-69, 72, 74, 78, 79, and 81-83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411) in view of Klosterman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576), Sampat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724), Donald Firesmith ("An Expanded View of Messages") in view of Maa (U.S. Patent No. 5,818,935).

² The claim amendments have been made to fix claim dependency, and such that the recited dependent claims now claim dependency to allowed independent claim 84.

Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, and some of the assertions of the cited art is not being specifically addressed, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status and assertions made with regard to the cited art and any official notice at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Accordingly, any statements and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to

Application No. 09/527,137 Amendment "D" dated July 6, 2005 Reply to Office Action mailed June 2, 2005



In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this ____ day of June, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER Registration No. 28,651 JENS C. JENKINS Registration No. 44,803 Attorney for Applicant Customer No. 022913

RDN:JCJ:ahm AHM0000001242V001

any assertion made with regard to the prior art, including the asserted prior art status of the cited art or any official notice.